



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 October 2019

by C Osgathorp BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M3835/W/19/3233780

Maple Leaf House, 37a Canterbury Road, Worthing BN13 1AJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr T&F Maio against the decision of Worthing Borough Council.
 - The application Ref AWDM/0534/19, dated 27 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is construction of additional storey to provide three flatted residential units comprising 2no. one bed units and a 1no. two bed unit.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the street scene and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2 storey flat-roofed building, which is utilitarian in appearance due its original industrial use. There is a group of single storey and 2 storey industrial buildings to the west of the appeal site, which are generally located to the rear of the houses in Canterbury Road. The appeal property has a street frontage on to Canterbury Road and therefore it is clearly visible in the surrounding residential area. Canterbury Road and the adjoining streets predominantly consists of 2 storey residential properties, which are similar in scale and designed with pitched roofs. Whilst the appeal property appears anomalous in the Canterbury Road Street scene due to its form and utilitarian appearance, the visual impact of the building is limited by its 2 storey height and its set back from the road.
4. The proposed development would add an additional storey to the building through the provision of a mansard roof, which would cover nearly the entire width of the building. Whilst the proposed mansard roof would be set back slightly from the external walls, it would appear bulky due to the combined effect of its height; the steep roof pitches; and its considerable width. The proposal would significantly increase the scale of the building, which would appear dominant and exacerbate the discordant appearance of the building in the street scene.
5. The appellant has drawn my attention to varying roof forms in the surrounding area, including a mansard roof on the single storey side extension at No 37

Canterbury Road and the jerkinhead roof at No 2 Friar Walk. However, these roof forms are on buildings of a much smaller scale than the appeal property.

6. I have had regard to the appellant's statement that the proposed development would improve the appearance of the building and help reinforce the distinctive residential character of the area. However, the proposed development would not constitute good quality architectural design and the proposal to finish the building in render/cladding would not overcome my concerns in respect of its scale and appearance.
7. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the street scene and the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore fail to comply with Policy 16 of the Worthing Core Strategy 2011 and the Guide to Residential development Supplementary Planning Document 2013 ('SPD'), which, amongst other things, state that all new development will be expected to demonstrate good quality architectural and landscape design and use of materials that take account of local physical, historical and environmental characteristics of the area. The appeal scheme would also be contrary to Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('Framework'), which, amongst other things, seeks the creation of high quality buildings and places.

Other Matters

8. The parties agree that the Council is unable to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites. As such, relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date in accordance with footnote 7 of the Framework. In these circumstances, paragraph 11(d) of the Framework should therefore be applied.
9. Whilst paragraph 59 of the Framework refers to significantly boosting the supply of housing, the net increase of 3 additional units would make a limited contribution. There would be a small social benefit in providing a limited number of additional housing units in an urban area close to passenger transport facilities. Modest economic advantages would also arise from the construction and occupation of the proposed dwellings. However, the harm to the character and appearance of the street scene and the surrounding area would be significant. As a result, the environmental role of sustainable development would not be achieved. The proposal would not safeguard and improve the environment and so it would not accord with paragraph 117 of the Framework in respect of promoting an effective use of land.
10. As such, the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. Therefore, the proposal would not be a sustainable form of development. The conflict with the development plan is not outweighed by other material considerations including the Framework.
11. I have had regard to the representations in support of the proposal, which state that the proposed development would significantly improve the existing building and would provide affordable flats. However, I find that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the street scene and the surrounding area, which would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of additional housing.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Osgathorp

INSPECTOR